moved by my hon'ble friend from Chittur is disposed of. That having been disposed of last time my point of order now is that he has to begin afresh. He cannot take it up from the stage where it was last left. There was a precedent not exactly like this when a similar motion like the one was passed over some years back with regard to the Tenancy Bill of Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja. When he moved a motion for the further consideration of the Bill this self same specific point came up for consideration. But this point never came up for consideration on account of the fact that the then Diwan President announced that the Government is preparing a comprehensive amendment and therefore that this amendment Bill need not be considered. There was thus no necessity for a ruling then. In the light of all these, I pray for a ruling on this point of order that the Hon'ble Member is not in order in moving this motion now. He has, Sir, according to me, under the Standing Orders, and the opinion of many experts on this subject to begin afresh. He has to begin with "leave to introduce" and get along with all the various intervening stages.

Mr. M. Sivarma Menon *(Advocate-General):* Sir, this is a matter which requires some close examination and it is not possible to give a definite opinion on the spur of the moment. The term used in the Standing Orders is "shall be considered to be disposed of". Thus the question for consideration is whether this disposal is for a particular session or whether it will be a disposal in perpetuity. If it is in perpetuity that member is prevented from bringing in the same motion before the expiry of a time limit prescribed in some other provision of the Standing Orders. Therefore I request that the Chair may be pleased to adjourn the consideration of this questlon to tomorrow.

Mr. President: I will give a ruling on this point of order tomorrow.

(iii) The Cochin Verumpattamdars' Act (Amendment) Bill

Mr. M. K. Verghese *(Cranganur):* Sir, I move that the Cochin Verumpattamdars Act (Amendment) Bill be taken into consideration.

Mr. Paramel Ipe Ipe (*Kunnamkulam*) : I second it.

Mr. President: Is the Hon'ble Member speaking on this Bill ?

Mr. M. K. Verghese *(Cranganur)*: No.

Mr. President: I think that in fairness to the House, the Member introducing a Bill should give some explanation of the scope and the object of the Bill.

മിസ്റ്റർ എം. കെ. വർഗ്ഗീസ്: സർ, നാളികേരവില വർദ്ധിച്ചാൽ ഓഹരി ജന്മിക്കും കുറഞ്ഞാൽ കുടിയാന്റെ ഓഹരി കൂടിയാനും ലഭിക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ഉദ്ദേശത്തോടുകൂടിയാണ് ഫ ഫ ഫവ-ലെ വ്യ-ാംനസ്സ് ആക്ട് നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തിയതു് എങ്കിലും തെങ്ങിൻതോപ്പുകാരായ വെമ്പാട്ടുകുടിയാന്മാക്ക് അതൊരു കണ്ണുകോടാലിയായിതീർന്നു എന്നു മനസ്സിലാക്കി ഫ ഫ ഫ ഠ-ൽ ഫ ഐ-ാംനസ്സായി നടപ്പാക്കിയ ഭേദഗതി ആക്ട് അവക്ക് കുറച്ചൊരു ആശ്വാസം നൽകി. എന്നാൽ പാട്ടശീട്ടു എഴുതിയ കാലത്തു ജന്മിയും കുടിയാനും എതൊരു തത്വത്തെ അടിസ്ഥാനപ്പെടുത്തി പാട്ടം നിശ്ചയിച്ചുവൊ ആ പാട്ടത്തിൽനിന്നു വ്യത്യസ്തമായ രീതിയിലാണ് ഈ നിയമം തീർന്നിരിക്കുന്നതു്. ഭൂമിയുടെ ആദായത്തെ അടിസ്ഥാനപ്പെടുത്തി പാട്ടം നിശ്ചയിച്ചു പാട്ടശീട്ടു എഴുതുകയാണ് ഈ രാജ്യത്തു നടന്നിട്ടുള്ളതു്. എന്നാൽ ഇന്നു നിലവിലുള്ള നിയമപ്രകാരം അതു പാട്ടശീട്ടു എഴുതിയ തിയ്യതിയേയുംകൂടി ആശ്രയിക്കേണ്ടിവന്നിരിക്കുന്നു. പാട്ടശീട്ടു എഴുതിയ തിയ്യതിക്കു മുമ്പുള്ള ഇരുപതുകൊല്ലങ്ങളിലെ നാളികേരവിലയുടെ ശരാശരി കണക്കാക്കി കിട്ടുന്ന തുക പാട്ടശീട്ടു എഴുതിയ തിയ്യതിയിലെ നാളികേരവിലയാണെന്നുദ്ദേശിച്ചു ആ വിലപ്രകാരം പാട്ടത്തുകക്കു എത്ര നാളികേരം വേണമൊ അത്രയും നാളികേരമൊ, അത്രയും നാളികേരത്തിന്റെ പാട്ടം കൊടുക്കുന്നു കാലത്തെ വില പാട്ടശീട്ടുപ്രകാരമുള്ള തുകയിൽ കൂടുതലായിരുന്നാൽ കൂടുതലിന്റെ പകുതിയും പാട്ടശീട്ടുപ്രകാരമുള്ള തുകയും കൂട്ടികിട്ടുന്ന സംഖ്യയൊ, തന്നാണ്ടു വില കുറവായിരുന്നാൽ കുറവിന്റെ പകുതി പാട്ടത്തുകയിൽനിന്നു കുറച്ചു കിട്ടുന്ന സംഖ്യയൊ തന്നാണ്ടു പാട്ടമായി കൊടുക്കണം. ഇതാണ് നിലവിലുള്ള നിയമം. പാട്ടശീട്ടു എഴുതിയ തിയ്യതിക്കു മുമ്പുള്ള ഇരുപതു കൊല്ലങ്ങളിലെ ശരാശരി വിലയാണ് അടിസ്ഥാനവില. അതിനാൽ പാട്ടത്തുക നിശ്ചയിക്കുന്നതിനു പാട്ടശീട്ടു എഴുതിയ തിയ്യതിയേയുംകൂടി ആശ്രയിക്കേണ്ടിവരുന്നു. അതു ജന്മിയും കുടിയാനും തമ്മിൽ ഉഭയസമ്മതപ്പെട്ടു പാട്ടം നിശ്ചയിച്ചതിനു വിരുദ്ധമായിതീ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

രുന്നു. അനുഭവത്തിലും വിസ്തീർണ്ണത്തിലും വ്യത്യാസമില്ലാത്തതും ഒരേ നിരക്കിൽ പാട്ടം നിശ്ചയിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതുമായ ഭൂമികൾക്ക പാട്ടശീട്ട എഴുതിയ തീയ്യതിയുടെ വ്യത്യാസംകൊണ്ട് പലേത രത്തിലുള്ള പാട്ടം കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതായി തീർന്നിരിക്കുന്നു. ഉദാഹരണമായി ക ാ ാകെ. പാട്ടം നിശ്ചയിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള രണ്ടു ഭൂമികളെ എടുക്കുക. ഒരു ഭൂമിയുടെ പാട്ടശീട്ട ക ക ക ആ കക്കടകം അവസാനത്തെ ആഴ്ചയിൽ അതായതു ഡ ങ-ാംനു- എന്നു ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുക. മറേതിന്റെ പാട്ട ശീട്ട ക ക ക ന ചിങ്ങം ക-ാംനു-യും അതായതു് ആദ്യത്തേതിന്റെ പാട്ടശീട്ട എഴുതി ഇ ദിവസത്തിനുശേഷവും എഴുതി എന്നു ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുക. ഈ ഇ ദിവസത്തെ വ്യത്യാസം ഒരു യാദൃച്ഛിക സംഭവമായി വരാവുന്നതാണു്. ഇന്നു നിലവിലുള്ള നിയമപ്രകാരം ആദ്യത്തെ ഭൂമിക്കു ഡ ന്ത ങ്കിക. ഈ കൊല്ലം പാട്ടം കൊടുക്കുമ്പോൾ രണ്ടാമത്തെ ഭൂമിക്കു ന ാ ഭ—ക ർ—ഡക. പാട്ടം കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവരുന്നു. ആദ്യത്തെ ഭൂമിക്കു കൊടുക്കുന്നതി ലും ക ന ഡ നാളികേരം കൂടുതൽ രണ്ടാമത്തെ ഭൂമിക്കു കൊടുക്കണം. ഇനി വേറൊരു പ്രകാ രത്തിൽ നോക്കുക. ഡ ാ ാകെ. പാട്ടമുണ്ടായിരുന്ന ഒരു ഭൂമി രണ്ടു സമഭാഗമായി ഭാഗിച്ചു രണ്ടുപോരും ക ാ ാകെ. വീതം പാട്ടംകാണിച്ചു് ക ക ാ ർ-ൽ വെവ്വേറെ പാട്ടശീട്ട എഴു തികൊടുത്തു. അതിലൊരാൾ ക ഡ കൊല്ലം കൂടിയപ്പോൾ അതായതു് ക ക ക ന്ത-ൽ പാ ട്ടശീട്ട മാറി എഴുതികൊടുത്തു. പാട്ടത്തുകയിൽ വ്യത്യാസമൊന്നും വരുത്തിയില്ല. ഇപ്പോൾ നടപ്പിലിരിക്കുന്ന നിയമപ്രകാരം പാട്ടശീട്ട പുതുക്കി എഴുതികൊടുത്തയാൾ ഇക്കൊല്ലം ന ാ ഭ—ക ർ—ഡക. കൊടുക്കുമ്പോൾ പുതിയ പാട്ടശീട്ട എഴുതിക്കൊടുക്കാത്ത മൂലം ഡ ർ ഭ—ഭ—ാകെ. മാത്രം പാട്ടം കൊടുത്താൽ മതിയാകുന്നതാണു്. ക്രമപ്രകാരം പാട്ട ശീട്ട മാറി എഴുതിക്കൊടുത്തയാൾ ന ാ—ഭ—ഡക. അധികം കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവരുന്നു. ഇ ങ്ങിനെയുള്ള ന്യൂനതകൾക്ക ഒരു പരിഹാരം കാണേണ്ടതു അത്യാവശ്യമാണു്. ഈ നി യമം പാസാകുന്നതിനു മുമ്പു് ഒരേതരത്തിൽ പാട്ടം കൊടുത്തിരുന്നവർ ഇപ്പോൾ പലതര ത്തിൽ പാട്ടം കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവന്നതു് ഏതൊരു തത്വത്തെ അടിസ്ഥാനപ്പെടുത്തി പാട്ടം നി ശ്ചയിച്ചുവൊ അതിൽനിന്നു വ്യത്യസ്തപ്പെട്ട ഒന്നിനെ അടിസ്ഥാനപ്പെടുത്തി നിയമം സൃഷ്ടി ച്ചതുകൊണ്ടാകുന്നു. പാട്ടം നിശ്ചയിക്കുന്നതിനു അടിസ്ഥാനമായി ജന്മിയും കുടിയാനും സ്വീകരിച്ചിരുന്ന തത്വത്തിൽനിന്നു വ്യതിചലിക്കാത്തവിധത്തിൽ വേണം നിയമം ഉണ്ടാ ക്കുവാൻ. അതിനാൽ നാളികേരവില വർദ്ധിച്ചാൽ കൂടുതലിന്റെ ഓഹരി ജന്മിക്കും കു റഞ്ഞാൽ കുറവിന്റെ ഓഹരി കുടിയാനും സിദ്ധിക്കത്തക്കവണ്ണവും പാട്ടം ഭൂമിയുടെ ആദാ യത്തിനാസ്പദമായിരിക്കണമെന്ന തത്വത്തിൽനിന്നു വ്യതിചലിക്കാതെയും നിയമം ശരിപ്പെ ടുത്തണമെന്ന ഉദ്ദേശത്തോടുകൂടിയാണു് ഈ ഭേദഗതി കൊണ്ടുവന്നിരിക്കുന്നതു്.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Sir, the Government.....

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Is the Government going to reply or is the Government.....

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* I waited for some time and since nobody rose to speak I stood up.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Will I be allowed to speak, Sir?

Mr. President: Yes.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Sir, I have very great pleasure to second this motion moved by my Hon'ble friend Mr. M. K. Verghese with regard to the payment of pattom to the land-lords in cases where the holding is mainly a cocoanut garden. The House may be aware, Sir, that in the original draft Bill there was no provision like this nor was there a provision like the one now existing in the Act, *viz.*, sub-section (2) of section 5, when the Select Committee which examined the original draft submitted its report. It was a main amendment tabled by Government that was responsible for this clause 2 appearing in section 5. It has to be admitted, Sir, that taking a long range though for certain reasons taking view of things, I supported that amendment, the amendment tabled by Government at that original stage. Now with the actual working of the Act from 1118 Kumbham down to this day I now feel guilty for the wrong support that I gave to the Government amendment. Now this is an unwanted and unworkable clause that was introduced by the Government for reasons best known to them. It was not either in the original draft Bill or in the Bill as reported upon by the Select Committee. That it is an unworkable and harmful thing to the tenantry is clear from the fact that no less a person than my esteemed friend the then member for Kanayannur Ezhuvas, the present Hon'ble Minister for Public Works and other Departments, tabled an amending

Bill not long after the original Bill became law. There were other amending Bills also. The Select Committee that was then considering two or three amending Bills to the Act recommended that what now appears as sub-section 2 of section 5 of the Act or something different from that may be adopted. Then after discussion, the provisions of the amending Bill of my Hon'ble friend was accepted by the House by way of compromise between the two rival interests. Thus we have in our Statute Book clause (2) to section 5 inserted in place of the original sub-clause (2) introduced by the amending Act of 1120. That provision has been working now for the last two years and the subject matter of the motion before this House is the difficulty, not exactly a difficulty, the meaninglessness of the existing provision as explained by the Hon'ble mover. As explained by the Hon'ble mover two lease deeds executed in different years but for identical extent and quality and by the same land-lord fixing the same amount of money as the pattom payable will be subject to two different amounts of pattom calculated under the existing provision. This certainly would not have been in the contemplation of the parties which alone is the test to be applied in the interpretation of documents. What the Hon'ble Member wants through this amending Bill of his is that sub-clause (2) of section 5 of the Cochin Verumpattamdars' Act may be amended by substituting the words "that the market rate of cocoanuts was Rs. 4-8-0 on" for the words "of the average market value of cocoanuts for a period of twenty years prior to." Therefore to understand it correctly I will have to read the existing provision and its amended form if this amendment is allowed to come in there. The existing provision in the Act is "Where cocoanut is the major produce of a garden land and the pattom fixed under the contract of tenancy is payable in money, it shall be obligatory on the part of the Verumpattamdar to give and the lessor to accept the pattam accruing due after the commencement of this Act in kind computed on the basis *of the average market value of cocoanuts for a period of twenty years prior to the date of the contract of tenancy or the money value thereof computed at the market rate prevailing on the date* on which such pattom accrues due;". Now the object and the purpose and the reasonableness of the amendment is very clear, in this way. *Now the pattom is to be fixed on the average of 20 years' value of cocoanuts preceding the date of the contract of tenancy.* It is a very well-known cannon of law that the intention of the parties is to be respected in toto in interpreting any Statute or Contract. If that is so, Sir, it must be presumed if this original provision as it is here is allowed to remain, that it was in the mind of the contracting parties, *viz.*, the land-lord and the tenant. When they fixed the pattom as shown in the document evidencing the contract that they had taken into account the average of twenty years pattom is something which can never be considered to have been in their minds. In the first place the average of these years was never known to the land-lord or the tenant. If they had such knowledge it had not anything to do with the fixing of a particular amount of money in the contract of tenancy is clear. Therefore as stated in the statement of objects and reasons to the Bill in these words "to fix in place of the average of twenty years the figure Rs. 4-8-0 per hundred" will be a reasonable thing as explained here. As pointed out in the statement of objects and reasons very big estates having very large extensive cocoanut gardens as its property and leased to tenants have fixed the price of cocoanuts at Rs. 4-8-0. The Paliam Estate has fixed that to be the price. That Estate is now under the management of the Government. The price of Rs. 4-8-0 is not the average but it is the actual amount calculated as reasonable. The average after all is not very particular in deciding this factor. Average is average and it is particularly well-known to everybody. I am just reminded of the story of a carpenter who tried to take the average for fording a river. He began to record the necessary measurements in Koles and by the time he reached a few yards from this side of the shore, the current washed him away. I can only say that the demand fixed by the Paliam Estate is a very sensible one. Considering the hard position into which the tenants would be driven if the actual average is fixed, they have fixed in the name of the average the price of Rs. 4-8-0. Therefore my submission is whatever be the average price for the twenty years, I think there must be reasonableness in fixing the price and that reasonableness must certainly open the eyes of Government and the Government should see that justice is done to the hard hit agriculturists. Sir, it is very pleasant to have a look at the cocoanut gardens while we are having a short trip in the backwater areas of the Cochin-Kanayannur Taluk. The difficulties that have to be undergone even to give you seemingly good picture are only known to the tenant. First of all they should have a big investment, they have to carry on a fight against the pests, they want various other things like manure, labour, etc., which are all very costly now-a-days. Taking all these factors into consideration I think it is only fair if the provision in the amending Bill now under consideration is accepted.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

It shall be presumed that whatever be the figure worked out on the average principle that it may be fixed at Rs. 4-8-0 if the purport of the first part that is clause 1 of my friends amendment. I shall now read to the House clause 2 of section 5 as it would be when this amendment goes in there.

The amended clause shall read "where cocoanut is the major produce of a garden land and the pattom fixed under the contract of tenancy is payable in money it shall be obligatory on the part of the Verumpattamdar to give and the lessor to accept the pattom accruing due after the commencement of this Act in kind computed on the basis *that the market rate of cocoanut was Rs. 4-8-0 on the date* on which such pattom accrues deel. Thus much for clause 1 of the amending Bill.

Now, Sir, the next clause namely clause 2 as printed here reads like this. In proviso (1) to sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Cochin Verumpattamdars, Act, VIII of 1118 between the words "is" and "the pattam" the following shall be substituted:

"between the commencement of the Act, VIII of 1118 and the commencement of this Act". The proviso to clause 2 of section 5 as it stands now reads as follows.—

"Provided that—

Where the date of the contract of tenancy is *after the commencement of this Act and before the commencement of the Cochin Verumpattamdars' Act 17/20, the* pattam payable in kind under this sub-section shall be computed on the market value of the cocoanut prevailing on the date of the contract of tenancy". That is an amendment upon the original Act. There was no proviso like that in the original Act, as became law on the 19th of Kumbham 1118. There was only sub clause (2) without any proviso. These provisos were added seemingly to the advantage of the tenant. In its place now that the Hon'ble mover and several other cocoanut garden owners have found that it is not an advantage to the tenant and the mover wants that to be substituted as shown in clause 2 of the amending Bill. As amended it will read as follows: "Where the date of the contract of the tenancy is *between the commencement of the Act, Act 8 of 1118 and the commencement of this Act* the pattom payable in kind under this section shall be computed on the basis of the market value of the cocoanut prevailing on the date of the contract of tenancy". This change is easily understood as following from clause 1. That relieves the garden owner to a very great extent. The hardship is very much lessened.

Now in clause 3 of the amending bill it is provided as follows: "In sub-section (3) to section 5 of the Cochin Verumpattamdars Act, VIII of 1118, the words "and the average rate" shall be deleted. That clause is consequential upon the other two clauses one and two being accepted. Class 3 in the present Act reads as follows. "The Market rate *or the average rate* for cocoanuts for the purpose of sub-section (2) shall be deemed to be such rates as Government or such officer specially authorised may by notification in the Government Gazette specify in this behalf." By this amending clause 3 it will read like this: "The market rate for cocoanuts shall be deemed to be such rates as Government or such officer specially authorised may by notification in the Cochin Government Gazette specify in this behalf." My submission, Sir, is that this is a very necessary, Amending Bill absolutely necessary one and therefore this amending Bill may be accepted by the Government. But in another amending Bill which follows namely my amending Bill the attempt is to take away clause 2 to section 5. If that will be accepted by the House there will be no necessity for this amending Bill for, the attempt there is to do away with clause 2 of section 5 altogether. That mischivous clause must vanish from Act 8 of 18 which considered to have given fixity of tenure seemingly and an in variable pattom except with regard to cocoanut gardens. Another amendment Bill is pending with Government with the press note matter still engaging the attention of the Government. We hope that we shall have all that we want in the interests of the tenants without harm to the Jenmies. And if my amending Bill that follows this is acceptable and—I shall try my level best to see that it is accepted by this House not by force, not by argument, not by persuation but by reason of justice of the demand contained in that Bill which is there, patent.

I was submitting, Sir, that if my amending Bill that follows this is accepted this may not be necessary. The Hon'ble mover will himself concede that. What I suggest is this. When Mr. Krishnan Ezhuthassan's Verumpattamdars Amendment Bill was referred to a Select Committee it was stated in the House—not that the Government committed itself to that position that Mr. V. R. Krishnan Ezhuthassan's Bill as also this Bill as also the succeeding Bills

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

may all go to the same Select Committee, to be considered as a whole and necessary amendments and changes effected and then what comes out of the Select Committee may be considered by this House. There was a suggestion by the mover which was considered by a very large Section of the House probably inclusive of the Government of that day that it may well be done so. I make the suggestion even now so that I need not say anything on the succeeding Bills at this stage. These Bills, all the four of them, may well go to the same Select Committee and the Committee may be directed to expedite their consideration so that all these 4 Bills the one before the Select Committee already this one and the succeeding one as also the amending Bill moved by the Hon'ble Deputy President may all be considered together. These 4 amending Bills will cover up a lot of the unhappy things that are existing in Act VIII of 1118. with these observations I second this Bill.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Sir, this House is fully aware of the fact that the provisions in the Verumpattamdars' Act 8 of 18 relating to the payment of pattom in kind is based on the average of the 20 years on the date of the contract of tenancy was introduced after a good deal of controversy and it was as a measure of justice both to the landlord and the tenant. The House then took the view that such a stable measure is necessary. That does not mean that the question is not again open for consideration. (*Hear, hear.*) The Government are prepared to keep an open mind in this matter but I may want the Hon'ble mover that Government are not accepting even one single argument advanced by him nor do I accept some of the points raised by the Hon'ble Member from Vadakkancheri, because the section as it goes does not insist a person who has executed a lease deed to-day and a lease deed 4 days afterwards to pay different kinds of pattom, because the number of coconuts is to be determined with reference to the average price of coconuts for the last 20 years prior to the contract of tenancy and this House will appreciate regard being had to the period taken into consideration that there may not be such a vast difference. That argument would have been quite alright prior to the introduction of this amendment. I therefore submit that Government while they are prepared to keep an open mind are not committed to any principle. Therefore, without any more trying to take up the time of this House I have to announce that Government have absolutely no objection for this matter being considered again by the very same Select Committee. Government will keep an open mind upon this question and the whole question could be reviewed again.

Mr. M. K. Verghese *(Cranganur):* I have no objection to refer this Bill to the Select Committee of Mr. V. R. Krishnan Ezhuthassan's Bill.

The motion was put and carried

Secretary to the Council: The title of the Bill is The Cochin Verumpattamdars Act (Amendment) Bill.

Mr. M. K. Verghese *(Cranganur):* I move that the Bill be referred to the Select Committee which is considering Mr. Krishnan Ezhuthassan's Bill.

Mr. Paramel Ipe Ipe *(Kunnamkulam):* I second it.

Mr. President: I will ask the Revenue Minister to serve on the Committee in the place of the Diwan Peishkar.

Motion put and carried

(iv) The Cochin Verumpattamdars' Act (Amendment) Bill

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Mr. President, I move that the Cochin Verumpattamdars' Act (Amendment) Bill be read in Council and in doing so I just want to briefly state the scope of the amending Bill. What is excluded from the provision of the Verumpattamdars Act as far as the Municipalities are concerned is attempted to be included. In the case of the hard hit man going by the name of Kudikidapukars who is now excluded from the definition of the word "tenant", he is also attempted to be brought under the definition as also Varapattam and Pankupattam tenants. Another clause introduces that beginning of something that is very necessary and that is this. Instead of having a few landholders, jenmies or zemindars by whatever name these people may be known, I want to bring into existence a class of peasant proprietors. That is the purport of clause 4 of the amending Bill. Look at the beauty of that! How enjoyable in contra-distinction to the man who does not know what he should do with the enormous extent of property that he possess. And the last clause is to do away with the monstrouse clause 2 of section 5 dealing with pattam of cocoanut gardens. I am sure that this Bill

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly